



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,680	07/30/2003	Kristian Hammond	08803-024	6562
24573 7590 11/09/2007 BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLP P.O. Box 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690			EXAMINER STACE, BRENT S	
			ART UNIT 2161	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/629,680		HAMMOND ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Brent S. Stace		2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 30-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 30-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 January 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/22/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed August 29th, 2007. Claims 1-9 and 30-81 are pending. In the amendment filed August 29th, 2007, Claims 1-9 are amended, Claims 36-81 are new, and Claims 1, 6, 9, 55, 64, and 73 are independent. The examiner acknowledges that no new matter was introduced and the claims are supported by the specification. This action is made FINAL.

Response to Arguments

2. The Applicant's arguments filed August 29th, 2007 with respect to Claims 1-9 and 30-81 have been considered but are not persuasive.
3. As to the applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1-9 and 30-81 for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching "the adaptive weight system," the examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant submits that in Budzik "if a term is emphasized, its preliminary weight is double the original preliminary weight" (Remarks dated 8/29/07, p. 15, and Budzik, p.4, section 4.1, second to last paragraph). This doubling of emphasized terms is a form of adaptive weighting since only emphasized terms are given more weight (Budzik changes the weights based on the emphasis of the terms, or in other words, Budzik adapts the weights of the terms based on their emphasis).
4. As to the applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 55-81 for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching "the use of fields," the examiner respectfully disagrees. Titles,

Art Unit: 2161

sections and terms in, for example, a word document, are fields in the word document.

Budzik is at least using fields when word documents are analyzed. These field attributes in a word document are equivalent to the previously claimed "stylistic attributes" since these field attributes also hold stylistic attributes (e.g. font size) and taught in the cited sections of Budzik below. Also, specifically, the use of email fields are not claimed in Claims 55, 64, or 73.

5. The other claims argued merely because of a dependency on a previously argued claim(s) in the arguments presented to the examiner, filed August 29th, 2007, are moot in view of the examiner's interpretation of the claims and art and are still considered rejected based on their respective rejections from at least a prior Office action (part(s) of recited again below).

Response to Amendment

Claim Objections

6. Claims 31 and 78 are objected to because of the following informality:

- a. Claim 31 recites "lease" on line 2 and "relates" on line 4. These appear to be typographical errors.
- b. Claim 78 depends on Claim 72. From the content of the claim (especially the preamble) it appears that Claim 78 should instead depend on Claim 73. This appears to be a typographical error.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 9, 34-36, 49-54, 73-77, and 79-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101

because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 9 and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because it is not limited to tangible embodiments.

In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification at pages 21-22, lines 8-12, the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., disks) and intangible embodiments (e.g., carrier waves). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory. The claims may be favorably considered if the word "medium" in the claims was replaced by "storage device." Claims 34-36, 49-54, 74-77, and 79-81 inherit the deficiencies of Claims 9 and 73 and fail to cure them.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 1-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

11. Claims 1, 6, 9, 55, 64, and 73 recite the limitation "the representative text items."

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. This rejection propagates downward through dependent Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 30-54, 56-63, 65-72, and 74-81.

12. Claim 36 recites the limitation "The method of claim 9" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

13. Claim 48 recites the limitation "The system of claim 1" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

14. Claims 37, 38, 43, 44, 49, and 50 recite the limitation "style attribute." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

16. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 30-37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 57, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 69, 70, 72, 73, 75, 78, 79, and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "User Interactions with Everyday Applications as Context for Just-in-time Information Access" (Budzik et al.) (in an Applicant's IDS).

Claim 1 can be mapped to Budzik as follows: "An adaptive method for obtaining representative text items from a plurality of text items in an active computer task, [Budzik, p. 3, section 3] the method comprising:

- receiving information indicative of the active computer task, the information including the plurality of text items [Budzik, p. 3, section 4] and at least one stylistic attribute associated with at least one text item in the plurality of text items; [Budzik, p. 4, section 4.1]
- computing a statistical value indicative of a number of occurrences of the at least one stylistic attribute in the active computer task; [Budzik, p. 4, col. 2, section 4.1]
- for each of the plurality of text items, assigning a weight based on the statistical value and the at least one stylistic attribute; [Budzik, p. 4, col. 2, section 4.1]
- ranking the plurality of text items based on the weight assigned to each of the plurality of text items; [Budzik, p. 4, col. 2, section 4.1] and
- generating the representative text items based on a result of the ranking step; [Budzik, pgs. 4-5, section 4.2]
- wherein the active computer task is a task other than entering search terms for the purpose of retrieving information" [Budzik, p. 3, section 3].

Claim 2 can be mapped to Budzik as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein the at least one stylistic attribute includes at least one of the font style, line height, font size and associated hyperlink" [Budzik, p. 4, section 4.1].

Claim 3 can be mapped to Budzik as follows: "The method of claim 2, wherein the weight assigned to at least one of the plurality of text items is increased in

response to the text item being located in a specific region of the active computer task" [Budzik, p. 4, section 4.1].

Claim 5 can be mapped to Budzik as follows: "The method of claim 1, further comprising forming a plurality of search terms based on the result of the ranking step" [Budzik, p. 4, col. 2, section 4.1].

Claim 6 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 1, in addition to a system and some elements for performing the method steps of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 1. Additionally, Claim 6 recites some elements not found in Claim 1, but can still be mapped to the same reference(s) as used in Claim 1 as shown below.

- "a data processor for processing data; [Budzik, p. 1 with Budzik, p. 3]
- a data storage device for storing instructions; [Budzik, p. 1 with Budzik, p. 3] and
- a data transmission path coupled to the data processor and the data storage device; [Budzik, p. 1 with Budzik, p. 3]
- wherein the instructions, when executed by the data processor, controls the data processing system to perform the machine-implemented steps of" [Budzik, p. 1 with Budzik, p. 3].

Claims 7 and 8 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 2 and 5, respectfully, in addition to a system and some elements for performing the method stepd of Claims 2 and 5, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 7 and 8 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 2 and 5, respectfully.

Claim 9 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 1, in addition to a medium and some instructions for performing the method steps of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 1.

Claim 30 can be mapped to Budzik as follows: "The method of claim 1 further including the step of determining properties of the active computer task;

- wherein the assigned weight is tunable based on the properties of the active task." [Budzik, p. 4, section 4.1].

Claim 31 can be mapped to Budzik as follows: "The method of claim 30, wherein the properties of the active task include at least one of application software being employed to perform the active computer task, a type of the active computer task, a genre of the active computer task, attributes relates to a user manipulating the active task, properties of an information source of which a search will be conducted, and a state of the active computer task" [Budzik, p. 3].

Claims 32 and 33 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 30 and 31, respectfully, in addition to a system and some elements for performing the method steps of Claims 30 and 31, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 32 and 33 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 30 and 31, respectfully.

Claims 34 and 35 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 30 and 31, respectfully, in addition to a medium and some instructions for performing the method steps of Claims 30 and 31, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 34

and 35 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 30 and 31, respectfully.

Claim 36 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 2, in addition to a method and some steps for performing the method steps of Claim 2. Therefore, Claim 36 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 2.

Claim 37 can be mapped to Budzik as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein the at least one style attribute includes at least one of a list element, a heading, a table heading, a table cell, a navigation bar, a menu, a header, and a footer" [Budzik, p. 4, col. 1, section 4.1].

Claim 39 can be mapped to Budzik as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein assigning the weight is based on at least one of a document genre, a document type, and a document subject matter" [Budzik, p. 4, section 4.1].

Claim 40 can be mapped to Budzik as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein assigning the weight is based on at least one of a genre of the active computer task, a type of the active computer task, and a subject matter of the active computer task" [Budzik, p. 4, section 4.1].

Claim 42 can be mapped to Budzik as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein assigning the weight is based on a location of a document associated with the active computer task, the location being determined by at least one of an associated URL, a file name, a directory name, and a string indicative of file location" [Budzik, p. 4, section 4.1].

Claims 43, 45, 46, and 48 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 37, 39, 40, and 42, respectfully, in addition to a system and some elements for performing the method steps of Claims 37, 39, 40, and 42, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 43, 45, 46, and 48 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 37, 39, 40, and 42, respectfully.

Claims 49, 51, 52, and 54 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 37, 39, 40, and 42, respectfully, in addition to a medium and some instructions for performing the method steps of Claims 37, 39, 40, and 42, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 49, 51, 52, and 54 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 37, 39, 40, and 42, respectfully.

Claim 55 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 1, in addition to a method and some steps for performing the method steps of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 55 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 1 (where the field attribute is equivalent to the stylistic attribute).

Claim 57 can be mapped to Budzik as follows: "The method of claim 55, wherein the at least one field attribute includes a web page address field" [Budzik, p. 4, section 4.1].

Claims 60, 61, and 63 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 39, 40, and 42, respectfully, in addition to a method and some steps for performing the method steps of Claims 39, 40, and 42, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 60, 61, and 63 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 39, 40, and 42, respectfully.

Claim 64 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 1, in addition to a system and some elements for performing the method steps of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 64 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 1 (where the field attribute is equivalent to the stylistic attribute and using the additional mappings shown in the rejection to Claim 6).

Claim 66 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 57, in addition to a system and some elements for performing the method steps of Claim 57. Therefore, Claims 66 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 57.

Claims 69, 70, and 72 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 39, 40, and 42, respectfully, in addition to a system and some elements for performing the method steps of Claims 39, 40, and 42, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 69, 70, and 72 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 39, 40, and 42, respectfully.

Claim 73 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 1, in addition to a medium and some instructions for performing the method steps of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 73 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 1 (where the field attribute is equivalent to the stylistic attribute).

Claim 75 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 57, in addition to a medium and some instructions for performing the method steps of Claim 57. Therefore, Claim 75 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 57.

Claims 78, 79, and 81 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 39, 40, and 42, respectfully, in addition to a medium and some instructions for performing the method steps of Claims 39, 40, and 42, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 78, 79, and 81 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 39, 40, and 42, respectfully.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

19. Claims 4, 59, 68, and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "User Interactions with Everyday Applications as Context for Just-in-

time Information Access" (Budzik et al.) in view of "SUITOR: An Attentive Information System" (Maglio et al.) (both in Applicant's IDS(s)).

For **Claim 4**, Budzik teaches: "The method of claim 3."

Budzik discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...wherein the specific region is a region of the active computer task that is selected by the user."

With respect to Claim 4, an analogous art, Maglio, teaches: "...wherein the specific region is a region of the active computer task that is selected by the user" [Maglio, p. 170, col. 1, section 1].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Maglio and Budzik before him/her to combine Maglio with Budzik because both inventions are directed towards observing user actions with information resources, model user information states, and suggest information that might be helpful to users.

Maglio's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Budzik's invention because both inventions use computers that monitor users. Budzik discloses user interactions with everyday applications as context for just-in-time information access (title) comprising monitoring documents of, for example, text editors, or web pages. However, Budzik does not expressly disclose specific region is a region of the active computer task that is selected by the user. Maglio discloses suitor: an attentive information system (title) comprising a means to monitor the user's eye-gaze

Art Unit: 2161

to determine where on the screen the user is reading (this determines a specific region of the active computer task that is selected by the user (via eye-gazing)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Maglio and Budzik before him/her to take the eye-gazing from Maglio and install it into the teachings of Budzik, thereby offering the obvious advantage of determining where on the screen the user is actually reading, thereby extracting and disambiguating meaningful information (demonstrated in Maglio, p. 171, col. 1).

For **Claim 59**, Budzik teaches: "The method of claim 55."

Budzik discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...wherein the at least one field attribute includes a product name."

With respect to Claim 59, an analogous art, Maglio, teaches: "...wherein the at least one field attribute includes a product name" [Maglio, pgs. 170-171, cols. 2-1].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Maglio and Budzik before him/her to combine Maglio with Budzik because both inventions are directed towards observing user actions with information resources, model user information states, and suggest information that might be helpful to users.

Maglio's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Budzik's invention because both inventions use computers that monitor users. Budzik discloses user interactions with everyday applications as context for just-in-time information access (title) comprising monitoring documents of, for example, text editors,

or web pages. However, Budzik does not expressly disclose analyzing text for product name(s). Maglio discloses a suitor: an attentive information system (title) comprising finding product name(s).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Maglio and Budzik before him/her to take the product name discoveries from Maglio and install it into the teachings of Budzik, thereby offering the obvious advantage of displaying context-based search results related to the product name(s) to satisfy information needs.

Claim 68 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 59, in addition to a system and some elements for performing the method steps of Claim 59. Therefore, Claims 68 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 59.

Claim 77 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 59, in addition to a medium and some instructions for performing the method steps of Claim 59. Therefore, Claim 77 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 59.

20. Claims 38, 44, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "User Interactions with Everyday Applications as Context for Just-in-time Information Access" (Budzik et al.) in view of "Query-Free News Search" (Henzinger et al.) (both in Applicant's IDS(s)).

For **Claim 38**, Budzik teaches: "The method of claim 1, wherein the at least one style attribute."

Budzik discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...includes a size of a bounding rectangle."

With respect to Claim 38, an analogous art, Henzinger, teaches: "...includes a size of a bounding rectangle" [Henzinger, p. 1, section 1].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Henzinger and Budzik before him/her to combine Henzinger with Budzik because both inventions are directed towards making suggestions from examining text.

Henzinger's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Budzik's invention because both inventions query resources based on examined text and display the result(s) to the user. Budzik discloses user interactions with everyday applications as context for just-in-time information access (title) comprising analyzing text from, for example, web pages and text editors. However, Budzik does not expressly disclose a size of a bounding rectangle. Henzinger discloses a query-free news search (title) comprising extracting queries from closed captions (which include a size of a bounding rectangle).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Henzinger and Budzik before him/her to take the extracting of queries from closed captions from Henzinger and install it into the teachings of Budzik, thereby offering the obvious advantage of being able to show

articles related based on any incoming text (and in a TV setting, being able to show related articles of a TV program, Henzinger, p. 8, section 4.1).

Claims 44 and 50 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 38, in addition to a system and some elements or a medium some instructions for performing the method steps of Claim 38. Therefore, Claims 44 and 50 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 38.

21. Claims 41, 47, 53, 62, 71, and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "User Interactions with Everyday Applications as Context for Just-in-time Information Access" (Budzik et al.) (in Applicant's IDS) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,206,791 (Hind et al.).

For **Claim 41**, Budzik teaches: "The method of claim 1, wherein."

Budzik discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach:

- "...assigning the weight is based on a user's role in an organization."

With respect to Claim 41, an analogous art, Hind, teaches:

- "...assigning the weight is based on a user's role in an organization" [Hind, col. 12, lines 1-8].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Hind and Budzik before him/her to combine Hind with Budzik because both inventions are directed towards assigning weights for search operations.

Hind's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Budzik's invention because both inventions use computers searching for data. Budzik discloses user interactions with everyday applications as context for just-in-time information access (title) comprising analyzing text from, for example, web pages and text editors. However, Budzik does not expressly disclose assigning weight based on a user's role. Hind discloses a system and method for managing and securing meta data (title) comprising assigning a weight based on a user's role in an organization.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Hind and Budzik before him/her to take the assigning a weight based on a user's role in an organization from Hind and install it into the teachings of Budzik, thereby offering the obvious advantage of determining search criteria a search to find information.

Claims 47, 53, 62, 71, and 80's limitation(s) have already been met by Claim 41's limitation(s). Therefore, Claims 47, 53, 62, 71, and 80 are rejected for the same reason(s) as stated above with respect to Claim 41.

22. Claims 56, 58, 65, 67, 74, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "User Interactions with Everyday Applications as Context for Just-in-time Information Access" (Budzik et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,768 (Rhodes et al.) (both in Applicant's IDS(s)).

For **Claim 56**, Budzik teaches: "The method of claim 55, wherein the at least one field attribute includes at least one of."

Budzik discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...an email sender field, an email recipient field, a signature field, and a salutation field."

With respect to Claim 56, an analogous art, Rhodes, teaches: "...an email sender field, an email recipient field, a signature field, and a salutation field" [Rhodes, cols. 10-11, lines 51-21].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Rhodes and Budzik before him/her to combine Rhodes with Budzik because both inventions are directed towards searching for documents based on context(s).

Rhodes's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Budzik's invention because both inventions use databases to search for documents and read/extract information from documents. Budzik discloses user interactions with everyday applications as context for just-in-time information access (title) comprising analyzing text from, for example, web pages and text editors. However, Budzik does not expressly disclose including at least one of an email sender field, an email recipient field, a signature field, and a salutation field. Rhodes discloses a method and apparatus for automated, context-dependent retrieval of information (title) comprising analyzing at least the from and date fields from emails.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Rhodes and Budzik before him/her to take the email analysis from Rhodes and install it into the teachings of Budzik, thereby offering the

obvious advantage of recognizing email documents as also text files thereby obtaining further context(s) for use in searching.

For **Claim 58**, Budzik teaches: "The method of claim 55, wherein the at least one field attribute includes at least one of."

Budzik discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...a document template, a header, a footer, a page number, a title, an author, a byline, and a date published."

With respect to Claim 58, an analogous art, Rhodes, teaches: "...a document template, a header, a footer, a page number, a title, an author, a byline, and a date published" [Rhodes, cols. 10-11, lines 51-21].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Rhodes and Budzik before him/her to combine Rhodes with Budzik because both inventions are directed towards searching for documents based on context(s).

Rhodes's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Budzik's invention because both inventions use databases to search for documents and read/extract information from documents. Budzik discloses user interactions with everyday applications as context for just-in-time information access (title) comprising analyzing text from, for example, web pages and text editors. However, Budzik does not expressly disclose including at least one of an email sender field, an email recipient field, a signature field, and a salutation field. Rhodes discloses a method

and apparatus for automated, context-dependent retrieval of information (title) comprising analyzing at least the from and date fields from emails.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Rhodes and Budzik before him/her to take the email analysis from Rhodes and install it into the teachings of Budzik, thereby offering the obvious advantage of recognizing email documents as also text files thereby obtaining further context(s) for use in searching.

Claims 65 and 67 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 56 and 58, respectfully, in addition to a system and some elements for performing the method steps of Claims 56 and 58, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 65 and 67 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 56 and 58, respectfully.

Claims 74 and 76 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 56 and 58, respectfully, in addition to a medium and some instructions for performing the method steps of Claims 56 and 58, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 74 and 76 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 56 and 58, respectfully.

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion


24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent S. Stace whose telephone number is 571-272-8372 and fax number is 571-273-8372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-5:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu M. Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brent Stace

B.S.


APU MOFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER